



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/753,082

01/08/2004

Holger Hoppe

543822003200

5415

25227

7590

02/03/2006

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/753,082

Applicant(s)

HOPPE, HOLGER

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11-7-05 *Request for Reexam and amendment*
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The filing of a request for reexamination is noted. Last office amendment has been entered. *Title is objected to as overlong, new title should refer to "wave-shaped contact pins."*

Page 18, lines 3,4 the equation is not understood and seems incorrect.

1. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Min alone or taken with Gammel.
2. Min, figures 2, 4, 5 shows a test sockets with connections pins that may be shaped in wave form, figure 8 but does not disclose different amplitudes. It is submitted, that in normal production and tolerancing, different size amplitudes would result. These dimensions need not be held the exact same size and the only requirement appears to be that the pin tightly fit the hole 32. In addition, since in applicants' specification no purpose for the "different amplitude" feature is disclosed, such form and that of claims 15-17 are deemed obvious variants. In addition, for claims 15-17, also obvious normal production whether intended or not could result in recited features in at least some or about half of the pins. Other dependent claims not at issue. Gammel added to show wave type pins 50, etc "prior" to entry into holes and for added discussion of manner of use of such pin. Obvious, should issues arise, to so form Min pins for secure retention in holes.
3. Claims 1-3,5, 8-9, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Min in view of Yamashita.

Art Unit: 2839

4. Min, figures 2, 4-5 socket taken with figure 8 lacks different amplitudes teaching.

Yamashita, pins have such portions at 14, 16. Obvious ^{to use such pins} in Min device for more secure retention to pcb. Dependent claim not at issue.

5. Claims 1-3,5, 7-9, 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Min in view of Belopolsky.


6. Min applied as above. Belopolsky, figure 3B shows an elastic pin of wave shape 680 with different amplitudes, different distances from centerline of 611. Also see figure 6C. Obvious to use same in Min for the figure 8 pin. Motivation would be formation of low cost pin.

7. Arguments most in view of new rejections.

8. Applicant asked to address the "normal production" assertion as applied above to Min and to point out purpose of feature ^(different amplitudes) at issue; is it discussed in specification? If to be added note prohibition on new matter. What advantage does this feature provide? None seen that provide benefit over Min or Minter If any is asserted it should be clearly demonstrated with use of drawings included in remarks.

Shlesinger, see figures 6-10, Minter see figure 4.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322